



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Essai comparatif sur l'origine et l'histoire des rythmes. Par MAXIMILIEN KAWCZYNSKI. Paris, Bouillon, 1889. 220 pp. 8vo.

If we judge by the name of the author of this treatise we can safely assume he is a Slav. If we consider his doctrines philosophically developed we can see at once that he brings to his work a mind unfettered by the traditions of Western scholarship. The laborious effort of the Celt and Teuton to construct what he considers to be unnatural theories meets with little sympathy from him. To their conclusions he applies the measure of common sense (he does not say this in so many words, but yet we feel it everywhere in his calm logic), and finds them on all sides deficient. Accordingly he makes short work of the perverted views of modern civilisation. He starts from the standpoint of reason, and fortifies himself with the teachings of the ancients, whom he apparently respects to a certain degree.

Without delaying to write a preface, M. Kawczynski unfolds at once the principles underlying his work. Rhythmical phenomena, which regards the form of things and not their substance, may coincide, as has been claimed, with certain movements of nature, the falling of a leaf or the beating of the heart. But we are certain of rhythm only as it is expressed in the historical domain of art, of art relating to movements. There we find a fundamental condition of rhythm to be equality of parts, at first of all, afterwards of pairs. While natural symmetry is the law, yet psychological symmetry can exist in poetry as well as in the arts of repose. The origin of rhythm is then to be sought in a regular succession of equal parts. What further forms the essential nature of rhythm must be determined by careful investigation, for it is more than probable that the modern notion of rhythm is not the primary conception. Thus the view advanced by Wilhelm Meyer of Speyer that Latin rhythmical poetry is derived from accented Syriac verse (a view criticised later by M. Kawczynski), or the theory of those who hold that there existed a primitive Aryan poetry founded on accent, show a serious defect in method, in that their advocates are too easily satisfied with superficial comparisons. To recognize analogy the principle must be first known, otherwise the superstructure has no foundation. And it must be also borne in mind that, while the historical sciences have many axioms, they also assume many hypotheses, which, when they are considered near at hand, are found not to be logical principles, but rather vague and preconceived ideas, due to sentiment and obstructive of the search after true laws. But while our crusader would gladly attack these false positions along the whole line, he limits himself for the present to the notions regard-

ing rhythm. To combat these he presents two kinds of arguments, the negative and the positive, beginning with the former.

The theory that there existed among the Aryans, previous to their migrations, a system of verse is propped up by giving to the verses of sixteen syllables in the Vedic and Sanscrit the same origin as the Saturnian verse of the Romans and the long verse of early Germanic and Anglo-Saxon poetry. Hence the *glokas* of the Sanscrit epic would be conformable to the *rann* of early Irish poetry. But the verses of the Irish poetry are of fourteen syllables, or twice seven syllables, and are separated from the Vedic by rime and alliteration. These latter features hold true also of the long Anglo-Saxon and Germanic verse, which, indeed, has no definite number of syllables. Nor is the measure of the Saturnian verse counted by syllables, and M. Kawczynski agrees with the grammarians of antiquity in considering this verse to be but an imperfect imitation of the Greek metrical verse. Finally, the hexameter, a supposed descendant of the Aryan system, is based on the notion of the rhythmical foot, unknown to its assumed relatives. Thus disappears one argument of the sentimentalists.

A side-thrust at the theories of Scandinavian mythology follows. The Edda is not only different in its underlying conception from the Rig-Veda, but has no counterpart in Slavic tradition, which is nearer the primitive source. Hence it must have been derived from the West, from Rome and Greece, as its twelve deities indicate. But this in passing. The main point of the second negative argument is that the primitive state of man, far from being an Age of Gold, was a period of utter wretchedness and barbarism, little calculated to foster art. Art implies a certain conception of existence and a knowledge, however limited, of facts, which cannot belong to a society entirely without cultivation. Hence poetry, music and the dance cannot be autochthonous. For (repeating the argument in another form) a verse is an arrangement of parts and syllables according to definite rules, which rules assume analysis of language, thought. Nor can music be spontaneous, as is seen by examples of the present day; it must be acquired by practice. In like manner the dance is an art to be learned. Rhythm is certainly unknown to Sanscrit literature.

The source of the autochthonous theory of art is to be found in national pride. It is essentially modern, started by Bishop Percy, and was not suspected either by the ancients or by the men of the Middle Ages. And as a matter of fact our present art, whether architecture, music or poetry, is the survival of mediaeval art with additions from the Renaissance, which drew from the Greek and Roman world. The department of popular literature most developed reveals in many cases a definite and individual source for popular tales in Sanscrit literature, where they are confessedly of learned origin, being due to priests. The same may prove true of the other branches of folk-lore when scientifically established.¹

Having thus exposed the weakness of his opponents, M. Kawczynski

¹ M. Kawczynski might have here fortified his position by showing that among the people the point of the story was often lost (this is particularly true of the American negroes) and its moral generally misapplied. He applies further on a similar line of argument.

turns to the positive side of his argument and develops carefully his views, based on reason and confirmed by ancient tradition, his two guides in this matter. Every initiative, he affirms, is personal. Every invention is personal, the product of a mind superior to its fellows, and not of the crude mass of mankind. So the Greeks made their gods inventors. Over against the few inventive men of genius stands the crowd of imitators, who adopt their views more or less imperfectly. The people neither invents nor is changed save from the outside. It is the few who thus create in the process of centuries a language and establish schools of art and literature. If this imitation of the few by the many be admitted, then popular forms are posterior to artistic, however primitive be the latter. In like manner the less civilized nation is seen always seeking the arts and knowledge of the more cultivated, and instances are obvious when clothes, arms, religion and even language have been adopted. To illustrate by a point in question, that of poetry, the Germans of the ninth century so followed after Latin metres that Otfried states nothing was written in German.¹

With this evidence admitted, the existence of an ancient German epic is seriously menaced in spite of the testimony of Tacitus and Eginhard. A much more probable source for it can be found in the adaptation to historical events of the outlines of the Trojan war, both from the Aeneid and the Latin Iliad, and in the remains of Greek mythology. The career of Siegfried is that of Jason with elements derived from Achilles and Perseus. The Nibelungen verse may be modeled on the alexandrine. Rome was the social and political ideal of the mediaeval world. Troy was the traditional birthplace of both Frank and Celt. The earliest period of German literature is an imitation of Latin models, the succeeding one of French and Provençal. There is no reason to except the epic alone from the rule.²

Proceeding from this consideration of early German literature, M. Kawczynski notes the interdependence of modern literary movements and quietly pays his respects to the theory of Taine, which he would allow to be applicable to ancient Egypt only. He admits that the nations while borrowing have transformed the ideas received and adapted them to new surroundings. Thus the Fates of the Greeks have become the fairies of the Latin races and the swan-maidens of the German. The natural conditions which differentiate peoples have affected their literature only so far as the choice, the treatment or the particular preference given to this or that side of a subject are concerned. But these impulses came from the leaders, the few. They prove not only that historical influences are stronger than natural surroundings, but that, the same social forces having been always in action, prehistoric influences must be taken into account, excavations

¹ . . . dum a propriis nec scriptura, nec arte aliqua ullis est temporibus expolita. Quippe qui nec historias suorum antecessorum ut nullae gentes ceterae, commendant memoriae, nec eorum gesta vel vitam ornant dignitatis amore. Letter to the Archbishop of Mainz.

² Throughout all these preliminary remarks, which constitute an Introduction in fact, the Germanic epic attracts especially the author's attention. He abandons it at this point to return at the end of the volume (p. 207), where he states that circumstances have compelled him to defer the presentation of his views on a like popular theme: the manner and the time of the formation of Scandinavian mythology.

revealing the presence of foreign merchants among barbarous peoples at a very early epoch. So arts were trafficked in and ideas were lent and borrowed, and the past and the present are bound together by a thousand ties, invisible but indissoluble. To prove the validity of this reasoning by the study of the history of rhythm is the object of the successive chapters of the treatise, thus introduced in so striking a manner.

Ch. I. *Le vers est issu de la proposition et le vers rythmique est né du vers syllabique.*¹—The origin then of rhythm is unknown, but it is reasonable to suppose that it is to be found in that art in which it is most prevalent, the verse, and that rhythm is the product of an observation made upon the verse, is in fact an invention. That rhythm is not an offspring of music, as is generally held, seems evident from the opinion that music must have originally consisted in the song, the verse, and thus music is later than the verse. Now three kinds of verse are handed down by tradition: metrical, syllabic and irregular. The last, the least perfect, must have been the first in chronological order, and, though not preserved by the Greeks, can be found among other Aryan peoples of a later date but of a primitive state of cultivation. On the same ground of relative perfection the syllabic would precede in point of time the metrical verse.

The point at issue is, therefore, the origin of the irregular verse. It is probable that it came from the form of language which most resembles it, the proposition, the expression of an opinion. And indeed the earliest verses show this parallelism, overflow being a later invention, which is periodically attacked by the purists, thus showing the innate aversion to it. But the object of the first verses was worship. They were prayers and incantations, which implied experience in the service of the gods and hence were due to priests. The most primitive form of worship is found in the prayers of the Arval brothers.

The second step in the evolution of the verse was to make the propositions equal in length, thus giving them in the rude minds of their hearers greater value. The Merseburger Zaubersprüche are an instance in point and reveal an attempt at five accented words in a verse. This was doubtless followed by an effort to make the verses equal in the number of words, a more apparent harmony than an equal number of syllables, the proposition being written as a whole in manuscripts still extant. Thus in the Saturnian verse, already considered, the base is in fact the word, the word being a rough imitation of the Greek metre which served as model. This notion again appears in the Toulouse rhetorical school of the sixth century. After counting the words came the count of the syllables, a task which Otfried himself found difficult when he applied it to the German tongue. But his verse shows a careful cultivation of rime, as he indeed declares, while the notion of accent is entirely absent. His model was perhaps the leonine hexameter, so frequent at the time, and his strict observance of the rime without regard to the exact number of syllables has its counterpart in

¹ Inasmuch as M. Kawczynski has thrown the headings of his chapters into the form of theses I may be pardoned for preferring his own words to a translation. The many points of interest which he discusses or indicates, coupled with the concise and argumentative presentation of his theories, render the task of a reviewer unusually arduous.

later crude imitations of the French octosyllable. This last step, a fixed number of syllables, was the hardest to take.

There remains to be considered the evolution of rhythmical verse. The ancients were peculiarly sensitive to the duration of syllables, a fact attested by Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and distinguished accurately the long from the short in their alphabet and script. The verse having advanced through the various degrees of perfection noted above to a form consisting of a fixed number of syllables, it can be supposed that an inventive genius, endowed with a delicate ear, happened on one composed entirely of long syllables and thus apparently longer than the others (a supposition treated as a fact in *las Leys d'Amors* (xiv c.)). Likewise one made up accidentally of short syllables would seem too short. This inventor, a priest without doubt, would seek to gain the favor of his deity in harmonizing the differences by a union of the two and thus create two verses of long and short syllables alternating, conformable to the law of equality already enounced. The notion of rhythm being absent from Sanscrit literature, this process can be attributed safely to the Greek genius, to which the great development of rhythm is certainly due. Definitions of rhythm quoted by M. Kawczynski from many Greek writers support this view of its origin. But, according to Quintilian and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, rhythm and foot are equivalent terms. Greek tradition designates the dactyl as being the original foot, but, since it contracts in Homer into a spondee, the trochee or the iambus is more probable.

Ch. II. *Le mètre n'était originairement qu'une mesure, un terme fixe du rythme.*—Notwithstanding the opinion of modern philology, metre and rhythm have the same principle, metre in fact being but a part of the rhythm, its measure, as the ancients affirm. They conceived rhythm as a long chain of equal links and metre as a definite part of the chain. Yet metre, based on syllabic verse in which were contained rhythmical feet, was the first invention.

Ancient tradition considered the earliest verse to be either the senarius, the tetrameter or the hendecasyllable. If the last, certainly posterior to the others, be excluded, there remain the two former, each of which fulfills the theoretical condition of utterance in one breath. The majority of the ancients seem to look upon the senarius as the older form, but the caesura of the tetrameter, which comes at the end both of the foot and the word, appears less artificial than that of the double senarius, which occurs in the middle of a foot. The caesura of the tetrameter also corresponds better to the division of a proposition into the subject and its modifiers on the one side and the predicate and its adjuncts on the other.

Another conception which appears wholly modern is that of the vocal ictus. On this subject the authors of antiquity are silent. Their testimony agrees in indicating by the beat of the foot or the rise and fall of the finger, and not by the voice, both the arsis and thesis. The ictus on the arsis is no other than a notion of Bentley elaborated by Hermann, who was led astray by the modern theory of rhythm in poetry, where the accented syllable takes the place of the long syllable of the ancients. In the same

manner the modern musical rhythm, in which the ictus has come to be a necessity, differs entirely from that of the ancient world, which was an alternation of long and short syllables.

Ch. III. *L'accent antique formait la mélodie du vers et semble avoir donné naissance au système musical grec.*—The errors of modern scholars regarding both the poetical and musical rhythm of classical civilisation having been pointed out, it is in order to show how ancient accent differed from modern accent. Accent (*accentus*, *adcantus*) in antiquity was the rise or fall of the voice on each syllable, the acute accent being the highest tone, the grave the least high, and the circumflex denoting the descent from one tone to another. In Greek there was also a fourth accent in contracted syllables, rising from the lower to the higher tone, from the grave to the acute. The Greek language was naturally very melodious and needed only the rhythmical verse to change the accents into a melody. According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus the Greek accents were included in the space of a musical fifth, but this is evidently the extreme range, since early Greek music did not exceed in space a musical fourth. This statement M. Kawczynski illustrates by the first verse of the *Iliad*. Among the Romans also the few writers who touch on the subject admit the relation existing between accent and music, notwithstanding the popular attribution to the gods of the invention of music. To support this theoretical inference it is known that the early Greek lyre had three strings, corresponding probably to the three accents, the assumed source of music. M. Kawczynski finds also a confirmatory passage in Dionysius, who notes the fact that in a chorus of Euripides (in *Orestes*) the melody does not coincide with the accent, the words *Σίγα, σίγα, λευκὸν* being sung on the same tone in spite of the difference in accents. Furthermore the lyre of four strings contained the interval of a half-tone, which can be ascribed to the sliding accents of the Greek language alone, while the musical third may be due to the falling of the acute accent at the end of words. The doubling of the tetrachord must have given the melody an advantage over its parent, the accent, and this tendency was increased by the addition of two other tetrachords to this octachord, one above and the other below, and connected with it by a common note. Thus the system of Greek music was formed and in a way which renders the passage from Dionysius intelligible. The three Greek musical scales can be explained by the difference in accent between the Dorians, Phrygians and Ionians respectively.

It is interesting to contrast for a moment the theory and demonstration of M. Kawczynski, as applied to music, with those of the school which considers the movements of the human body and the human mind to set out from the same point as those of nature. Darwin, as is well known, states that music is the evolution of the amatory sounds uttered by the male in courtship. Mr. Herbert Spencer, returning to the subject in the November number of the *Popular Science Monthly* (1890), reviews his opinion formerly expressed and sums up his present position as follows: "Music has its germs in the sound which the voice emits under excitement, and eventually gains this or that character according to the kind of excitement." And as

a conclusion: "The origin of music as the developed language of emotion seems to be no longer an inference but simply a description of the fact." This is the theory of Darwin generalized. The principle is the same. Cries are the foundation of melody. How they become melodious and thus give rise to musical modulations is not explained other than by the very vague steps of evolution. Placing by the side of these indistinct views and absolute assumptions the careful and methodical research of M. Kawczynski indicates sufficiently the disparity of reasoning.

Passing to the study of the accents in themselves it is seen that they had no relation to the ictus or to the rhythm, but that their musical character was so inherent as to cause them to be used as signs of musical notation even in the Middle Ages. The difference which exists between ancient accent, a singing accent, and modern accent can be plausibly explained by the very development of the musical scale and the consequent bad taste of preserving a sing-song in ordinary speech. But there can be no doubt that modern music is derived from that of ancient Greece, since the presence of two scales and two half-tones in each identify them beyond question. Greek music was handed down to the Eastern Church, which transmitted it through Hilary, Ambrose and St. Augustine to the Western liturgy. Its uncertain and fluctuating forms were reduced to order by Gregory the Great and the rhythmical song found itself changed into the plain chant. The tenth century, by the introduction of harmony, witnessed a further transformation of the original scheme. The history of so-called popular music is identical, the various kinds now recognized being due both to the period and the choice made by each borrower among the nations.

Ch. IV. *La mesure rythmique ayant à répondre à trois différents objets, trois rythmizomena, a été amenée à une abstraction qui provoqua une séparation entre la rythmique et la métrique. Les Romains écartèrent cette division en soumettant les rythmes aux lois métriques.*—Musical and metrical rhythm being then the same in origin, there remains of the arts of movement the dance, which tradition shows closely united to both song and poetry. According to Plato and other writers of antiquity the dance was in essence the pantomimic representation of the thought of a verse. Its source may have been in the processions of the chorus. Later it escaped from the restraints of the text, but still remained subject to the law of rhythmical feet, long and short movements, as can be seen at the present day in the minuet, the fandango and various oriental dances. But in the pantomime, which was often restricted to gestures, the feet remaining motionless, it was impossible to mark an ictus, and hence no ictus existed. Thus all the arts of movement came from the proposition through the verse, and the syllable is the measure of the rhythm, according to the ancient tradition, but contrary to the opinion of Aristoxenus, who represented a new school and indicates a departure from the original practice. This departure, as Plato also notes, consisted not only in separating the dance from the music, but also in composing airs without a text, songs without words, which Plato considers in bad taste (*Laws* 670). A common measure for the three arts was then necessary, and it was obtained by reducing the syllabic measure

to an abstraction, preserving the form, the beat, while doing away with the text, the substance. In process of time this common measure received different names, metre when applied to poetry, rhythm when applied to music, a step which M. Kawczynski proves by a quotation from Servius.

The basis of classical metre and rhythm is the foot, measured either by syllables or beats. For the iambus the original rule demanded a short and long syllable, but Aristoxenus claimed for it three beats, and so on with the other feet. To determine the nature of a foot it must be repeated, and thus we reach a second unity in the double foot or colon. But the independent existence of the cola is lost when they become metres, as in the iambic or trochaic dimeter, and the metres once fixed preserve their form much better than the variable rhythms. So we find that the rules for metre are in fact the original rules for rhythm, and that the later metres can be easily distinguished from the earlier by the admission of later rhythmical feet, which were measured by beats before they were held down to the measure by syllables. All metres, however, were sung *κατὰ στίχον* in Greece, but probably were no longer sung in Rome.

It follows that rhythm, subject to the law of beats, possessed a much greater liberty of foot substitution than did metre, governed by syllables. As in metre, the rhythmical feet combined into cola (which, however, retained a certain independence), the cola into periods, the periods into strophes, and all these combinations as well as the original feet varied according to the taste of the poet (certain strophes, however, as the sapphic became fixed like the metres). As the nature of the foot is determined by its repetition, so is also that of the metre, and that of the strophe, whence arose in Greek songs strophe and antistrophe. But this natural order was perverted by artistic poets to a correspondence of the first and the last strophe, and so on until finally poems were written in which there were no corresponding strophes.

The Romans, in adopting the musical system of the Greeks, despaired of imitating their liberty of lyric verse, as is confirmed by both Cicero and Dionysius. Horace adhered to metrical regularity, and Seneca varied the song of his choruses only by intermingling the metres. And thus the inherent love for order and law in the Roman character is responsible for bringing together again metres and rhythms.

Ch. V. *La rhétorique latine contient quelques notions et quelques éléments particuliers qui se retrouvent dans la poésie latine et surtout dans la poésie du moyen âge.*—The artistic basis for poetry being now established, light can be thrown on its development in the West by the theories of rhetoric in vogue among the Latins, borrowed, however, from the Greeks. Poetical rhythm was introduced into orations by rhetoricians who were at the same time poets. Cicero attests (*De oratore* III 48) the presence of the cola of the dithyrambus, of vocal flexion—sing-song, to use the common phrase. This rhythm arose from the natural melody of the accents, strengthened by the introduction of musical cadences, and became finally an abuse against which Quintilian was obliged to protest (*Institutiones* XI 3). Its form approximated that of the verse, the first and last feet of the propositions

being conformable to rules, while the intermediate portion was free, Cicero's *numerosa cadere*.

The ancient treatises on rhetoric considered also the subject of rime, which some modern scholars, notably Wilhelm Meyer of Speyer, deny to Latin poetry before Commodianus. Yet Plautus (*Menaechmi* 20-29) uses final rimes, and Propertius leonine, and the books on rhetoric prove that these instances were intentional and not accidental. Cornificius recommends a moderate use of rime in orations and gives examples of two kinds, while the propositions equal in length, so frequent an ornament of rhetoric, often end in rime. Cicero states even that certain propositions demand a rhythmical cadence also rimed, whence came the transformation of the word *rhythmus* into the Provençal *rims*, meaning both rime and rhythm.¹ It seems then beyond question that the rime of the Middle Ages had its beginnings in the rhetoric of the Romans.

It is possible that mediaeval alliteration had also the same origin. Alliteration is found in Latin poetry, and the Romance idioms preserve many phrases which must have existed in the speech of the populace. Furthermore, the treatises on rhetoric blame the abuse of alliteration, especially in the middle of words. Of the two kinds, they consider the one, *adnominatio*, aided the sense of the words, while the other, *adlitteratio*, emphasized their sound. The former is probably the older, since it first consisted in repeating the same root with different prefixes and suffixes so as to impress the hearer, a process known also to the Rig-Veda and the Slavic. It is this kind which is most frequent in the Romance languages. A development of the *adnominatio*, due clearly to artistic effort, is the *adlitteratio*, which brings together words of supplementary meaning and similar sound. In the modern languages alliteration first appears in the poetry of the Germanic nations, where it seems indeed fundamental. But if it be admitted that it is not autochthonous, it must have been borrowed from the nations to the West, since alliteration, properly speaking, is unknown to the Slavs. A product of Latin cultivation, it could be communicated to the Germans by the manuals of rhetoric and the schools of Gaul. In the same way it could penetrate to the Irish and Anglo-Saxons, who in turn would extend its use through their missions on the Continent. Again, alliteration in German poetry may not be a principle but an ornament only, as it was among the Romans, though a passage from Isidore of Seville, praising the moderation of Vergil in its employment, anticipates already the later rule of the German writers. The medium through which all these attributes of Latin poetry passed into the modern languages—rime, alliteration, the adaptation of the hexameter to heroic Germanic verse—was the literature of the monastic schools, the intellectual guides of the Middle Ages. Yet alliteration can hardly be of Latin invention, since the rhetoricians frequently apply to it terms of Greek origin. It must therefore have been known to the Greeks, and Ebers claims even to have found both it and rime in Egyptian documents.

¹ This confusion seems to exist also in the mind of Du Bellay. See la Deffence et illustration de la langue francoyse, Part II, c. vii.

Ch. VI. *La rythmique séparée de la métrique par la mesure abstraite du temps s'éloigne plus encore de son principe originaire sous la prédominance du chant, et tend à une transformation complète.*—Latin poetry, having changed Greek rhythmical periods into metrical verse, presented apparently no essential difference between rhythm and metre. Yet the Romans, in the transformation which the rhythmical principle received at their hands, insisted more and more on the law of beats in rhythms, as is explained at length by Quintilian. This law, given full play, allowed the mutual substitution of cola and of feet, provided the measure of beats was kept. Hence there was no place for the ictus claimed by the moderns. The difference between metre and rhythm was further increased in Rome by the influence of song, which freed itself from the restraints of the metrical law, as it had done in Greece from the law of accent, and which modulated the syllables of the text according to the effect desired, as is seen in St. Augustine. That rhythmical liberty was practiced by the ancients is sufficiently attested by Dionysius and Longinus. Therefore neglect of metre is not due to the corruption of speech, though the notion of quantity held back the innovators for some time and gave to the rhythms of the classical period the regularity of metres. When they began to break away from this confinement, the rhythmical tendency, noted above in the treatises on rhetoric, aided their escape. But the process went on gradually, and the writers who were witnesses of the evolution frequently confuse rhythm and metre. Hence the conclusion of M. Kawczynski, that each rhythmical scheme is based on a corresponding metrical one and that the seeming regularity of the former is due to the melody.

The rule for the number of syllables is first recorded by Diomedes in the third century. St. Augustine testifies to the loss of the feeling of quantity in his time. The notions of rhythm which Bede handed over to the Anglo-Saxons: number of syllables, alliteration, rime and rhythmical cadence, he derived from Latin poetry. It is only the later poets of the Middle Ages who appear to be guided by accent in the cadence but not in the interior of the verse. This interesting chapter is closed by a quotation from a Celtic glossary: *Sicut est rhythmus comparatus metro, sic sunt bardī comparati poetis doctis, sic sunt bardī sine mensura apud se (qui non didicerunt compositionem metricam) comparati poetis doctis.*

Ch. VII. *Les vers rythmiques sont calqués sur les mètres.*—The rhythmical forms of the Middle Ages are much more numerous than those of Horace and Seneca. This is due to the models found in the minor Latin poets of the post-classical period, to the stichic use of metrical verses, and to new strophic combinations which betoken a finical tendency. Here M. Kawczynski passes in review the poets from the third to the ninth centuries, together with the kinds of verse they used, the earliest popular verses of the Romans and the antiphony of Bangor. He then discusses the metrical models of the later syllabic system, beginning with the verse of four syllables derived by the middle rime from the octosyllable, which in turn is based, contrary to the view of Meyer, on the iambic dimeter. The verse of five syllables comes from the adonius, of six from the twelve-syllable verse

having a middle rime, of seven from the iambic dimeter catalectic, of nine, rare, from the alcaic enneasyllable, of ten having a caesura after the fifth syllable from the anapaestic trimeter, while the decasyllabic verse having the caesura after the fourth syllable is modeled on the dactylic trimeter hypercatalectic, the caesura absent in the metrical original being invented by the rhythmical poets to differentiate this verse from the first named. For the verse of eleven syllables there are three models, the alcaic and sapphic hendecasyllable, having a caesura after the fifth, and the phalaecean, which had no caesura, contrary to the opinion of Bartsch and others. The verse of twelve syllables is based on the old senarius, when the caesura comes after the fifth syllable, but when the caesura falls in the middle it is patterned on the asklepiad. The verse of thirteen syllables, a late form, is an imitation of the alexandrine having a feminine caesura, and that of fourteen syllables generally results from the doubling of the seven syllable. The verse of fifteen syllables is from the ancient septenarius, while that of sixteen, if its existence be admitted, is a doubling of the octosyllable. Thus each rhythmical verse has a metrical model, directly or indirectly, retains the typical number of syllables and the caesura, if any. The accent is the rule only at the caesura and cadence. These conclusions of M. Kawczynski may expect to meet with many objections from Romance scholars.

Ch. VIII. *Les formes libres et variables de la rythmique grecque du moyen âge transportées dans l'occident y ont été réduites peu à peu aux formes de la rythmique latine.*—The starting-point of this chapter is a review of W. Meyer's *Anfang und Ursprung der lateinischen und griechischen rhythmischen Dichtung* (Abh. d. ph.-hist. Cl. d. bay. Ak. d. Wiss. XVII, ii), which claims a Semitic origin for rhythmical verse. But the Syrian poet, Ephrem, on whose writings the theory is based, did not draw his method from Semitic poetry but from Harmonius (iii c.), who, according to a Byzantine historian of the fourteenth century, was chosen as poet-laureate by his coreligionists because he knew Greek musical art. His songs, now lost, were written for two choruses, like the Greek lyrics. Furthermore it is now well established that Greek classical metres were already in the third century imitated by Christian poets writing subjective poetry, who transformed the metres into rhythms in much the same manner as did the Latins.

But a form of Byzantine poetry, the trope, has especial importance in Western literature. The trope, of which the earliest preserved was written by Justinian, varied in length from four to twenty cola. It became an essential part of the church office, adopted the features of the rhythmical verse, and in many instances shows by the marks of accents that these latter were signs of musical notation. The trope is often made up (a discovery of Meyer) of a proem, a strophe and an ephymnium, the last and first of varying length and form, while all indications point to a hesitating imitation of the lyric song. Introduced into the West as early as the ninth century, the use of the trope was authorized and recommended by Adrian II, and soon, under the name of sequences, it took on a great development, being gradually changed into rimed verses and strophes. Thus for a second time was Greek poetry reduced to order by the Latin mind.

After considering the many varieties of the sequence M. Kawczynski analyzes a curious system of versification, practiced in the sixth and seventh centuries by the rhetorical school of Toulouse, and handed down by one of the school, Virgilius Maro. Bombastic and obscure, this school bears a striking resemblance to the Symbolists of the present time and had a large following in its fondness for metaphor and metonymy. The poetical scheme adopted by the school demanded a fixed number of words for each kind of verse and that words of equal length occupy the same relative places in the verse, thus making the accents recur at the same point. Rime and a regular rhythmical cadence were also obligatory. Between this verse and the Byzantine trope there seems a close connection, in that the accents in each determine the melody, which must have been a monotonous chant, like that of the epic songs. M. Kawczynski points out the possibility that both these systems may be a survival of ancient tradition. What is certain is that the Toulouse school, much admired by Aldhelm, fostered among the Anglo-Saxons the notions of rime and alliteration. The musical value of the Latin accent as a sign disappeared, however, by the twelfth century.

Ch. IX. *La versification romane tire son origine de la rythmique latine, mais la plupart des formes lyriques romanes sont postérieures à l'introduction des séquences latines.*—Coming now to the origin of Romance versification, M. Kawczynski applies to it the same principles which guided him in the study of versification in general: common sense, tested by the earliest writers on the subject. *Las Leys d'amors* gives the definition of *rimus* (*rhythmus*) as a fixed number of syllables having a final consonance. Accent was required to recur at the caesura and cadence but elsewhere to be free, as in Latin. The notion of the foot had disappeared finally in Latin rhythmical poetry and is not found at all in the Romance system, which, nevertheless, preserves the scheme of the ancient metrical verse: length by syllables, the caesura and the regular cadence. And though the Romance verses are not rhythmical in the technical sense of the word, they are nevertheless rhythms, the new force of accent producing in them a modulation. Their direct models may have been either the Latin rhythmical verses, the general case, or even the classical metres in certain instances, depending on the literary knowledge of the poet. But in Latin all the syllables of the last word were counted in the cadence, whereas in Provençal and French the enumeration stopped with the tonic syllable of the last word. This difference can be explained in French by the pronunciation, but not in Provençal, and this fact would seem to indicate the priority of French poetry and its consequent influence on the Provençal.

Italian versification is derived from the French and Provençal, as is attested by Antonio da Tempo in his treatise on the subject (1332). This writer also confirms the opinions expressed above, that the rules of prosody were taken from the works on rhetoric and that rhythmical poetry belongs to artistic literature. His position as regards Italian is manifestly true. For the verse scheme does not count all the post-tonic syllables, in accordance with both the Latin and the nature of the Italian language, but offers a compromise to French influence in counting but one syllable after the

tonic, producing thus the so-called *piano*, *tronco* and *sdrucchiolo* rimes. Italian poetry prefers also an odd to an even number of syllables, in which it coincides with the rule of music down to the fourteenth century.¹

In the same way M. Kawczynski shows that the earliest Spanish verse is neither autochthonous nor derived directly from the Latin but is borrowed entirely from the French. Thus the latter is the common source of all Romance versification.

Should the same principle be applied to the strophic combinations of Romance lyric their origin would be Latin and artistic, not popular. Now at the time when Romance lyric appeared, the Latin lyric contained two distinct elements, the one of Roman origin, consisting of equal strophes and verse, the strophes having often a refrain either before or after the strophes, and the other of Byzantine origin, the sequence, in which at first the strophes were equal only by pairs while the verses or cola were unequal. From these two kinds proceeded the manifold creations of modern lyric. Thus the history of poetry is one: Greece acting on France, indirectly through Rome, or directly through the Church, and the mutual dependence of sacred and profane poetry is again demonstrated.

M. Kawczynski concludes, as he began, with a protest. Contemporaneous thought, he says, seeks to establish a complete homogeneity between physical and historical phenomena, and, to do so, subjects the latter to the former. But the one is the product of a blind causality; the other of a will seeking an end, finality. The terms are doubtless identical and physical laws may some day be proven to be final laws. Applying these principles to mankind, the origin of race comes within the domain of physical laws, while that of language is to be found only in the historical field. Language is an invention. Each new root is invented by some superior mind and afterwards accepted by the crowd. The origin of dialects, due to the separation of the peoples, is explained by the peculiarity of the pronunciation of some one leading man, taken up and propagated by the others.² Reasoning in like manner, popular poetry is not artistic poetry in its crude state, but rather a corruption of the artistic. Proofs for this statement can be adduced from Italy, where the strambotto is merely the remains of the tenzone, the ritornello of a volta, and the stornello of a motet, while at the present day in France the artistic romance and chanson continue to be the popular forms. So the Middle Ages developed music as it did poetry, but on ancient models; and Greek cultivation, if fully known, would be found to contain the germs of European civilisation. But to arrive at definite results, psychological laws must be applied to historical phenomena and must verify the historical method, as calculation verifies the phenomena of the physical world.

To criticise properly the study of M. Kawczynski demands a counter-

¹ From this point on M. Kawczynski devotes himself to the details of Romance versification, showing its interdependence and taking up successively its various forms. Fearing the effect on the reader of the already great length of this review, I have taken the liberty to transfer these especial points to the *Modern Language Notes* of January, 1891.

² This opinion was expressed and illustrated some years since by Arsène Darmesteter in a course of lectures at the Sorbonne.

article covering the whole subject from the beginning. His work forms a connected whole which leaves but few points exposed to attacks that do not assail his entire theory. The quotations from Greek and Latin writers, with which he buttresses his logic, are so numerous and varied that they can be accepted or rejected only after a diligent and most exhaustive research. Accordingly I have found myself compelled to submit but one side of the question, and to present what is in fact but an abstract of the volume before me. If in this I have done it justice—a difficult task, owing to the interdependence of the various questions discussed and to the close relation of the citations with the argument—the review will acquaint American students with the most important single work on versification which has appeared in recent times, revolutionary in theory and far-reaching in conclusions.

F. M. WARREN.

De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo. Scripsit SERGIUS SOBOLEWSKI. Mosquae, MDCCCXC.

De vi et usu praepositionum ἐπί, μετά, παρά, περί, πρός, ὑπό apud Aristophanem. Scripsit IOANNES ILTZ. Halis Saxonum, MDCCCLXXX.

Professor Sobolewski's treatise is a welcome addition to the apparatus of the student of Aristophanes. The best MSS are made the basis and a copious literature has been at the service of the author. The great lesson taught is the faithfulness of the comic poet to the prose standard of his time, though the lesson is no new lesson; for the Aristophanic scholar does not need to be told now-a-days¹ that not a solitary preposition is used by him otherwise than it would be used in prose, except for purposes of parody or paratragedy. Only in saying this we might seem to exclude from the list of Aristophanic scholars some editors of Aristophanes who do not think it worth while to notice exceptional syntax. Let us hope that after a time some of these things will get into the grammars, that some future Kaegi will note not only the scarcity of σύν in model prose as compared with μετά, but also the rarity of ἀνά and ἀμφί, will tell the schoolboy to what sphere of literature anastrophe belongs, and that Greek prose does not allow the preposition to be put between the adjective and the substantive—a liberty to which the novice in Greek is tempted by Latin examples.

Under the head of εἰς, ἐς Sobolewski follows the lead of Bachmann in making εἰς the only Aristophanic form before vowels—the nine examples of ἐς being accounted for by the tragic tone of the passages. In fr. 543, however, where Bachmann has ἐς because it is Ionic, S. denies with Meisterhans that ἐς is Ionic and writes with Bergk and Kock εἰς. The Dindorfian law of ἐς before consonants and εἰς before vowels is absolutely rejected by S., as E was written for EI down to 380 and ἐς is to be transliterated εἰς. Besides, he adds, if ἐς is the more elevated form before vowels, why should it lose that character when it is put before consonants? True, there are traces of ἐς in the old language, as is shown by the familiar formula ἐς κόρακας, as is shown by κὰς, which cannot

¹ 'Modes of expression inadmissible in prose were equally inadmissible in comedy except when they were employed for malice prepense and to give color to the work' (Rutherford, N. P. p. 38).